

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE | | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. | | |
|-----------------------------|------|---------------------------|----------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|--|
| 10/815,999 04/02/2004 | | Jim Vogeley | 4209-41 7278 | | | |
| 23117 | 7590 | 09/29/2006 | | EXAMINER | | |
| NIXON & | | HYE, PC OAD, 11TH FLOO | AGUIRRECHEA, JAYDI A | | | |
| ARLINGTO | | • | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER | | |
| | | | | 2834 | 2834 | |
| | | | | DATE MAILED: 00/20/2000 | DATE MAIL ED: 09/29/2006 | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | | Application No. | | Applicant(s) | | | | |
|---|---|--|---|---|--|--|--|--|
| Office Action Summary | | 10/815,999 | | VOGELEY, JIM | | | | |
| | | Examiner | | Art Unit | | | | |
| | | Jaydi A. Aguirrect | nea | 2834 | | | | |
| | The MAILING DATE of this communication app | | | orrespondence address | | | | |
| Period for | • • | | | | | | | |
| WHICI - Extens after S - If NO - Failure Any re | PRTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY HEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DASIONS of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 BIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period we to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, ply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing dipatent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | ATE OF THIS CO 36(a). In no event, however ill apply and will expire S cause the application to | MMUNICATION ver, may a reply be time IX (6) MONTHS from to become ABANDONED | l. ely filed he mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133). | | | | |
| Status | | | | | | | | |
| 1)🛛 | Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>20 Ju</u> | ily 2006. | | | | | | |
| 2a)□ ⁻ | This action is FINAL . 2b) This action is non-final. | | | | | | | |
| 3)□ : | Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is | | | | | | | |
| (| closed in accordance with the practice under E. | x parte Quayle, 1 | 935 C.D. 11, 45 | 3 O.G. 213. | | | | |
| Dispositio | on of Claims | | | | | | | |
| 4)🛛 | ⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-4,7-54,57-91,93-107 and 110-152</u> is/are pending in the application. | | | | | | | |
| 4 | 4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>18-47,65-90,95-99 and 118-152</u> is/are withdrawn from consideration. | | | | | | | |
| 5) 🗌 (| Claim(s) is/are allowed. | | | | | | | |
| | Claim(s) <u>1-4,7-13,15-17,48-54,57-63,91,93,94,100-107 and 110-116</u> is/are rejected. | | | | | | | |
| · - | Claim(s) 14,64 and 117 is/are objected to. | | | | | | | |
| 8)[(| Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or | r election requiren | nent. | | | | | |
| Application | on Papers | | | | | | | |
| 9)□ T | he specification is objected to by the Examiner | r. | | | | | | |
| 10)∐ T | 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner. | | | | | | | |
| Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). | | | | | | | | |
| Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). | | | | | | | | |
| 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152. | | | | | | | | |
| Priority u | nder 35 U.S.C. § 119 | | | | | | | |
| 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: | | | | | | | | |
| | 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. | | | | | | | |
| | 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No | | | | | | | |
| • | 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage | | | | | | | |
| * S | application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| Attachment | (s) | | | | | | | |
| 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) | | | | | | | | |
| 3) 🛛 Inform | e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) No(s)/Mail Date 7/06. | 5) 🔲 I | Paper No(s)/Mail Da Notice of Informal Pa Other: | te atent Application (PTO-152) | | | | |

Application/Control Number: 10/815,999 Page 2

Art Unit: 2834

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the

basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on

sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

1. Claims 1-4, 9, 12-13, 48, 52-54, 59, 62, 63, 93, 94, 100, 101, 105-107, 112, 115 and 116

are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Araki (US 4594526).

Araki discloses drive circuit that produces a drive signal for a device having a

piezoelectric actuator (10) and applies the drive signal to the piezoelectric actuator, wherein the

drive circuit is arranged to change dynamically the drive signal in dependence upon a sensed

operational parameter of the device (abstract) during real time operation of the device.

With regards to claims 2 and 4, the circuit elements 10, 44, 48, 46, 50, 52, 40, 42, 18, 20

and 22 constitute a closed loop that makes the displacement waveform of the bimorph 10 saw-

toothed when the signal f is saw-toothed.

Regarding claim 3, the signal comprises charge packets.

Claims 9, 12-13, 48, 53, 59, 62, 63, 93, 94, 100, 101, 105, 106, 112, 115 and 116 are

rejected for the same reasons.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are

-

Art Unit: 2834

such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 7, 10, 57, 60, 110, and 113 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Araki.

Araki discloses the claimed invention as explained above.

However, Araki fails to disclose the sensed operational parameter of the device being the resonance of the piezoelectric actuator.

Araki discloses that drive signal depends upon a sensed parameter. It is known in the art that the piezoelectric actuators are more efficient when driven at a frequency close to the resonant frequency of the device. The resonance of a piezoelectric actuator is a physical property of the device, and therefore, it would have been obvious at the time of the invention was made to select the resonance of the piezoelectric actuator as the physical parameter to be sensed in order to generate a driving frequency close to the range of the resonance frequency of the device and provide an efficient device.

3. Claims 8, 11, 58, 61, 111 and 114 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Araki.

Araki discloses a driving circuit for driving a piezoelectric device based on a sensed parameter.

However, Araki fails to disclose such parameter being temperature.

The broad teaching of Araki is that a drive signal could be controlled and determined based on a sensed parameter. It is the Examiner's position that it would have obvious to one ordinary skill in the art to sense a parameter, other than distance and such as temperature, to

determine and control the driving signal as necessitated by the specific requirements of a particular application.

4. Claims 15-17, 49-51, 91, 102-104 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Araki.

Araki discloses a driving circuit for driving a piezoelectric device based on a sensed parameter, but fails to disclose the piezoelectric device being a piezoelectric pump. Araki also fails to disclose the driving signal varying over time to deliver a non-continuous dosage of fluid.

First, it should be noted that it has been held that a recitation with respect to the manner in which a claimed apparatus is intended to be employed does not differentiate the claimed apparatus from a prior art apparatus satisfying the claimed structural limitations. Ex Parte Masham, 2 USPQ F.2d 1647 (1987).

Second, since Araki does not disclose the piezoelectric device being a piezoelectric pump, the deliver of a non-continuous dosage of fluid is not disclosed either. However, Araki's driving signal depending upon a sensed parameter would allow a non-continuous dosage of fluid to be delivered in the case where the driven piezoelectric element is a piezoelectric pump.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to use the driving control system as disclosed by Araki to drive a piezoelectric pump and to deliver a non-continuous dosage of fluid.

Allowable Subject Matter

5. Claims 14, 64 and 117 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Application/Control Number: 10/815,999

Art Unit: 2834

6. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

Page 5

The references of the Prior Art of Record fail to teach or suggest either alone or in obvious

combination the limitations as set forth in claims 14, 64 and 117, and specifically comprising the

limitation of the signal being obtained from a user input device.

Conclusion

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's

disclosure. See PTO-892.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Jaydi A. Aguirrechea whose telephone number is 571-272-2018.

The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th 9-7.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Darren E. Schuberg can be reached on 571-272-2044. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

JAA 9/25/06